

 **NRPC APPROVED MINUTES**  
**NRPC ENERGY FACILITIES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING**  
**06/26/15**

**MEMBERS PRESENT:**

Tom Young, Town of Litchfield  
Elvis Dhima, Town of Hudson  
Kat McGhee, Hollis  
Steve Wells, Mason  
Mark Bender, Town of Milford

Kermit Williams, Town of Wilton  
Tad Putney, Town of Brookline

**Others Present**

John Greene, Congresswoman Kuster's Office

**STAFF PRESENT**

Tim Roache, Executive Director

Sara Siskavich, GIS Manager

Karen Baker, Program Asst.

**CALL TO ORDER**

Williams called the meeting to order at 2:13pm.

**PRIVILEGE OF THE FLOOR**

Williams asked if there were any members of the public present that wished to speak. Julia Steed Mawson from Pelham introduced herself and thanked the group for their work. She added she did not wish to speak at this time but was there to gather data.

**APPROVAL OF THE MINUTES OF JUNE 5<sup>TH</sup> AND JUNE 12, 2015**

Williams moved on to approval of the minutes. He started with the minutes of June 5, 2015 asking if there was any discussion or changes. Putney informed that he was present for the June 5<sup>th</sup> meeting but not listed as members present. Siskavich commented that the minutes read "Approval of the Minutes of June 5 when they should be Approval of the Minutes of May 29<sup>th</sup>". After further discussion, Putney motioned to approve the minutes of June 5<sup>th</sup> as amended with a second from Young. All were in favor. Next Williams asked if there was any discussion or changes on the Minutes of June 12<sup>th</sup>. McGhee said that her question to Kinder Morgan was not written as it was asked and provided clarification to the EFAC. She had also provided that information to Baker for correction to the minutes of June 12<sup>th</sup>. After further discussion, Putney motioned to approve the minutes as amended of June 12 with a second from McGhee. All were in favor.

**DEBRIEF ON JUNE 17, 2015 FULL COMMISSION MEETING**

Roache informed the group that EFAC members present for the June 17<sup>th</sup> Commission meeting were Marchant, McGhee, Lynde, Young, and Williams who provided the presentation to the Commission on behalf of EFAC. Roache reported that he had spoken with Commissioners who expressed to him that the presentation was factual and was not "for" or "against." He added that the Commission is looking for direction from EFAC. McGhee expressed concern that the presentation portrayed clear support for the project, was heavy on industry narrative, and the Commission did not see enough to substantiate the EFAC statement of concern. Williams felt the presentation had a balance of negative and positive aspects relative to the pipeline. Young commented that he did not hear from the presentation that KM was going to be "a lifesaver," but he did think it conveyed the overall regional need for gas. McGhee commented that there was no debrief after the June 12<sup>th</sup> presentations and maybe should have been. Roache felt there was a lot of factual data on impacts, but that body of work by EFAC should have had more emphasis.

There was discussion on the statement that EFAC came up with, the role of the EFAC to provide data and provide a recommendation if necessary. Roache reminded the group that the Commission is advisory only. McGhee asked for clarity on exactly what type of information we should be distilling to the Commission and cited some examples of information not yet communicated to them. Putney reflected on his past role as an NRPC Commissioner and what types of information would have been helpful in his role, for example,

alternatives through Spectra and PNGTS. Williams noted that neither of those projects would provide gas to Liberty.

There was discussion on the flow of gas, where it comes from and goes to, when it is metered, size of this potential massive infrastructure, and if there are other alternatives that are not as destructive to communities. McGhee commented that Liberty is trying to make the case for need for gas, and their argument must be looked at with scrutiny because they are portraying that there is no other way. She asked is there a benefit beyond what people will suffer from this coming through. There was further discussion between McGhee & Williams on Liberty's parent company Algonquin and its relationship with KM, expanding the Concord lateral vs. building new infrastructure, and Liberty's ability to provide gas whether it comes from NED or not.

Williams commented on the gas prices in other areas vs. New England. McGhee questioned what the demand would be over the next 20 years and if this pipe would provide it. She added that EFAC needed to give more information to the Commission, for example, the narrowing of the energy portfolio. Roache agreed that there should be a diverse energy portfolio for New England. Williams felt the choices for combustible energy are coal, wood, and gas and the issues with not having options such as wind energy. Wells commented that there are 20 projects proposed and only 2 needed. He added that as a state, we should consider nuclear and we should fight hard for the right energy solutions.

Roache revisited the fact that majority of the NRPC communities don't see the need, and eight have made statements in opposition to NED. Given this, he asked how we can best support the communities. Williams said NRPC is advisory only. Roache agreed, but under this role EFAC does have the authority to make a statement to the Full Commission. He added that when you speak collectively as a region it holds much more weight. Bender made a motion to craft a strong concern statement about NED and to back it up with the lack of need, impacts related to construction, economic, historic, etc. Wells seconded it. There was further discussion on including other energy projects out there and the significant impacts to the energy portfolio. Roache suggested a statement should be done in the form of a resolution. Bender made a motion that EFAC should craft a strong concern statement about NED with supportive facts, and EFAC should also recommend to the NRPC Full Commission that they adopt the concern statement as a resolution in opposition. McGhee motioned with a second from Williams. All were in favor. Roache said the July Executive Committee can take up this issue and is authorized to act on behalf of the Full Commission. The group decided to brainstorm to come up with a statement. Information that the group felt should be included is listed below:

- Document Form of Committee Charge
- EFAC Summary of Findings
- There is a need in the region for natural gas heat, affordable generation of electricity and other energy sources for affordable energy and heat
- Issues with cost and only exporter of electricity in NH is Seabrook
- The multiple projects in various stages of approval are competing to fill that need
- Other projects leverage existing right-of-way rather than greenfield
- Environmental and socio-economic impacts.....therefore the NED (conclude with strong opposition statement)
- Intervener status
- List all categories of impact and provide whereas statements for each: economic, construction, historic, safety, environmental

On discussions about need, Putney commented that he like Selectman Maddox's statement about the average house uses 78 Dth/day and the pipeline is 2.2 billion Dth/day.

There was discussion between Putney, Bender & McGhee about there being a balance in the statement. Putney said that if KM files with FERC, we should ask NRPC to consider getting intervener status. Williams said that NRPC can't be an intervener based on the NH RSA. He suggested that towns in the NRPC region that have material impact file as single interveners. The group felt that that the pursuit of intervener status be researched. Siskavich pointed out that her understanding is two MA RPAs are pursuing intervener status. She also circulated a document from the MA RPA Pipeline Working Group which reflects a compilation of facts that could form the basis of Study Requests to FERC during the EIR Scoping Sessions. Siskavich said the Mass RPAs have advised their communities that this type of detailed and specific critique is what FERC will likely pay attention to, and it's unlikely that an argument based on a case for need would be a successful strategy with FERC.

Roache said he would pull from the white paper and put the bullets together for input into a draft statement. Siskavich agreed the bullets in the white paper were presented in a neutral voice but could be re-cast to support the position of the EFAC and communities in opposition. Putney said EFAC members should send input on a statement to Roache and Siskavich. Bender, McGhee, and Putney agreed to meet prior to the next EFAC meeting to assemble content for a statement.

There was discussion of EFAC collecting public feedback. McGhee suggested having Ken Hartledge from PlanNH to speak on behalf of the citizens. Siskavich informed the group of the scoping meetings coming up in the next few weeks as an opportunity to hear what the public has to say. July 30th there would be one at Milford Town Hall and 2 others in NH, one in in Nashua and the other Winchester. She added FERC would be running the meetings, and her understanding was the majority of the meetings would consist of citizens providing 3-minute testimonies. She suggested the group encourage folks to go. Roache added that public input from interested parties should be solicited and rolled into the white paper.

Siskavich referred to the issue of "Orderly Development of the Region," and also closer scrutiny of the NH PUC docket as other items the EFAC pointed out as action items in the whitepaper. Greene informed the group that Congresswoman Kuster wanted to meet with the group and that he would come back with dates that she is available.

Motion to adjourn came from McGhee with a second from Dhima. The meeting ended at 3:40pm. There next meeting would be on July 10, 2015.